

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**COMCAST CABLE
COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,
Plaintiff,**

v.

**SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS
COMPANY, LP,
Defendant.**

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 12-859

ORDER

AND NOW, this 16th day of August, 2017, upon consideration of Sprint's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Rule 50 (Doc. No. 462, filed March 21, 2017), Comcast's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law that Claim 113 of the '870 Patent is Not Obvious (Doc. No. 463, filed March 21, 2017), Comcast's Motion for a New Trial on Damages (Doc. No. 464, filed March 21, 2017), Comcast's Motion to Amend Final Judgment to Add Pre-Judgment Interest and Post-Judgment Interest (Doc. No. 465, filed March 21, 2017), Comcast's Response in Opposition to Sprint's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Rule 50 (Doc. No. 467, filed April 4, 2017), Sprint's Response Comcast's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law that Claim 113 of the '870 Patent is Not Obvious (Doc. No. 468, filed April 4, 2017), Sprint's Opposition to Comcast's Motion for a New Trial on Damages (Doc. No. 469, filed April 4, 2017), Sprint's Opposition to Comcast's Motion to Amend Final Judgment to Add Pre-Judgment Interest and Post-Judgment Interest (Doc. No. 470, filed April 4, 2017), Comcast's Reply Regarding its Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law that Claim 113 of the '870 Patent is Not Obvious (Doc. No. 474, filed April 14, 2017), Comcast's Reply in Support of its Motion for a New Trial on Damages (Doc. No. 475, filed April 14, 2017), Comcast's Reply in Support of its Motion to Amend Final Judgment to Add

Pre-Judgment Interest and Post-Judgment Interest (Doc. No. 476, filed April 14, 2017), Sprint's Sur-Reply in Opposition to Comcast's Motion for a New Trial on Damages (Doc. No. 477, filed April 21, 2017), Sprint's Sur-Reply in Opposition to Comcast's Motion to Amend Final Judgment to Add Pre-Judgment Interest and Post-Judgment Interest (Doc. No. 478, filed April 21, 2017), Sprint's Sur-Reply to Comcast's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law that Claim 113 of the '870 Patent is Not Obvious (Doc. No. 479, filed April 21, 2017), for the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum dated August 16, 2017, **IT IS ORDERED**, as follows:

1. Comcast's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law that Claim 113 of the '870 Patent is Not Obvious is **GRANTED**. Comcast's alternative motion for new trial on the question of whether Claim 113 is obvious, included in the Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law, is **GRANTED**;

2. Sprint's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Rule 50 is **DENIED**;

3. Comcast's Motion for a New Trial on Damages is **DENIED**;

4. Comcast's Motion to Amend Final Judgment to Add Pre-Judgment Interest and Post-Judgment Interest is **GRANTED**, and the Final Judgment entered on February 21, 2017, shall be **AMENDED** as follows:

a. Prejudgment interest on the jury verdict of \$1.5 million shall be awarded at the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield for February 17, 2006, or 4.7%, compounded annually, from February 17, 2006, until February 21, 2017;

b. Post-judgment interest on the jury verdict of \$1.5 million shall be awarded at the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield for February 17, 2017, or 0.82%, compounded annually, from February 21, 2017, until August 16, 2017.

c. Post-judgment interest on the combination of the jury verdict of \$1.5 million and all pre- and post-judgment interest accrued prior to August 16, 2017, shall be awarded at the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield for February 17, 2017, or 0.82%, compounded annually, beginning August 16, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois

DuBOIS, JAN E., J.